



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/202,244      02/19/99      BREUNIG

S      022701-803

021839      IM52/1107  
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

MOORE, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1712

DATE MAILED:

11/07/01

21

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/202,244

Applicant(s)  
Breunig et al.

Examiner  
Margaret Moore

Art Unit  
1712



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 19, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1712

1. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a hydrosilylation reaction, does not reasonably provide enablement for the general step of "forming" which includes condensation reactions, free radical reaction, etc. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to perform the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

2. Claims 22 to 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 22:

The newly added phrase "contains only SiH groups" renders this claim indefinite since it is unclear what this means. Note that the polyorganohydrogensiloxanes shown having various groups in addition to the SiH groups since  $R^2$  is not hydrogen. The limitation "contains only SiH groups" contradicts the formulas shown.

The  $S_i$  in each of these formula should be Si.

Claim 27:

It is incorrect to state that the synthon has each of these formulas, since the synthon is only one compound. Note the use of "and" indicating the cumulative.

Claim 38:

The term "vanishing" is a misspelling.

Claim 41:

It is unclear what is included by this claim. For instance, providing a catalytic composition alone is not sufficient to form a silicone oil. Obviously, something else must occur in this process for a functionalized silicone oil to be formed, but it is unclear what.

Art Unit: 1712

The term "functionalized" on its own is indefinite since it is unclear what is embraced by "functionalized". Specifically the conditions required for the Si bonded groups to be considered "functional" are unclear and as such it is unclear what is included by this term.

3. Claim 26 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. This claim fails to further limit claim 24, since all of the synthons in claim 24 include a hydrocarbon comprising ring in which is included an oxygen atom.

4. Applicant is advised that should claim 34 be found allowable, claim 35 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1712

7. Claims 22, 24 to 30, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jachmann et al.


8. Claims 34 - 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jachmann et al.

9. Claims 23, 30, 31, 33, 39, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jachmann et al.

10. Each of these rejections is based on the rejection rationale detailed in previous office actions. In view of this, the reasoning behind these rejections will not be repeated. The Examiner notes that the new claims are of the same scope as those previously examined, and as such the same grounds of rejection apply. The Examiner also notes that applicants have not provided any new arguments which would overcome these rejections.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Margaret G. Moore at telephone number (703) 308-4334.

Any **official** documents (after final rejection) can be faxed to (703) **872-9310**. All other **official** faxes should be sent to (703) **872-9311**. Please do not send any informal communication or proposed amendments to this number.

  
Margaret G. Moore  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1712

mgm  
Nov. 6, 2001